REMARKS

Claims 56-82 are pending prior to entering this amendment. The examiner rejects claims 56-59 and 63-66 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Levine (US Patent Application No. 2005/0015443). The examiner rejects claims 60-62, 67-69 and 74-76 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine in view of Chan, et al (US Patent No. 6,505,300). Applicant amends claims 56-58, 60-65, 67-72, 74-76, and 82. Claims 56-82 remain after entering this amendment. Applicant adds no new matter and requests reconsideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 and §103

The examiner rejects claims 56-59 and 63-66 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Levine. The examiner rejects claims 60-62, 67-69 and 74-76 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine in view of Chan. Applicant respectfully traverses the examiner's rejections.

Levine discloses a group membership module 11 that manages groups, such as a text messaging group, by allowing members of one group to broadcast messages to all of the other group members. The group membership module 11 allows any subscriber 4 to create a new group and invite other subscribers 4 to join the new group. See, Levine, paragraph [0070]. Once generated, the new group can receive requests from any subscriber 4 to join the new group, which may be accepted or denied by the subscriber 4 that created the new group. See, Levine, paragraph [0064]. The subscriber 4 that created the new group can also remove subscribers 4 from the group "presumably for bad behavior or parameter violations." See, Levine, paragraph [0068].

Claim 56 recites *electronically receiving a definition of a first group of a plurality of users, electronically receiving a definition of a second group of a plurality of users,* and *electronically receiving a definition of a desired group, where the definition of the desired group specifies that the first group is to be included in the desired group and the second group is to be excluded from the desired group.* Claims 63, 70, and 77 recites similar features.

According to the examiner, Levine's new group discloses the recited desired group. The examiner alleges Levine's subscribers 4 disclose the recited users. Levine, however, does not disclose any definition of Levine's new group that specifies a first group of subscribers 4 to be included in Levine's new group and a second group of subscribers 4 to be excluded from

Levine's new group. See, Levine, paragraphs [0064] and [0070], where Levine individually invites subscribers 4 to join the new group and individually removes subscribers 4 from the new group. In other words, Levine does not teach or suggest any definition of Levine's new group that explicitly includes or excludes a predefined group of subscribers 4, as Levine discloses individually adding or removing subscribers 4 from the new group. Levine, therefore, does not anticipate claims 56, 63, 70, and 77 or there corresponding dependent claims.

To crystallize this distinction, applicant amends claims 56, 63, 70, and 77 to clarify the recited desired group is created according to the definition of the desired group. For instance, claim 56 recites *automatically generating the desired group to include the first group and exclude the second group according to the received definition of the desired group.* Claims 63, 70, and 77 recite similar features. Levine's new group is not generated or created by including an entire group of users as the claims require, much less generating the new group responsive to the recited definition specifying which groups are to be included and excluded from the recited desired group upon creation. Levine further teaches away from generating its new group to expressly include any group of subscribers 4, as Levine requires each individual subscriber 4 to assent to their addition to the group, which occurs after Levine's new group is created. See, Levine, paragraphs [0064] and [0070]. Levine, therefore, does not anticipate claims 56, 63, 70, and 77 or there corresponding dependent claims.

Claim 57 recites *the definition of the first group or the second group identifies one or more properties shared by the users in the first group or the second group* and *dynamically generating the first group or the second group according to the received definition.* Claims 64, 71, and 78 recite similar features. The examiner alleges Levine discloses the recited limitations at paragraph [0125]. Paragraph [0125], however, discusses the ability of subscribers 4 to manage a group that has already been created. There is no disclosure in paragraph [0125] or anywhere in Levine of a definition of a first or second group that identifies at least one shared property of the subscribers 4, much less generating the first or second group according to the definition. Since Levine does not teach or suggest generating the first or second group according to a definition that identifies at least one shared property of the subscribers 4, Levine does not anticipate claims 57, 64, 71, and 78.

Claim 82 recites *a processing system ... to manage security of communications over a network according to at least one of the desired group or the plurality of groups, the processing*

to manage security of communications over a network by associating one or more network
security privileges or resources accessible on the network with the desired group or the plurality
of groups. The examiner alleges Levine's dismissal of subscribers 4 from a group discloses the
recited ability of a processing system to manage security of communications over a network.
Applicant amends claim 82 to clarify that management of network security of communications
over a network to include associating one or more network security privileges or resources
accessible on the network with the desired group or the plurality of groups. Nothing in Levine
teaches or suggests associating network security privileges on the network or resources
accessible on the network to Levine's new group, nor does Levine provide any motivation or
reason to associate these attributes with an entire group. Levine therefore does not anticipate
claim 82.

<div align="center">

CONCLUSION

</div>

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all claims of the application
as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503)
222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Jeffrey J. Richmond
Reg. No. 57,564

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575